

✓ SN



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/834,208	04/13/2001	G. Thomas Wolf		3950

42082 7590 02/18/2005  
CONWELL LLC  
130 LUBRANO DRIVE, SUITE 112  
ANNAPOLIS, MD 21401

EXAMINER

MENDOZA, MICHAEL G

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3731

DATE MAILED: 02/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/834,208

Applicant(s)

WOLF, G. THOMAS

Examiner

Michael G. Mendoza

Art Unit

3731

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 December 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3 and 5-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The Applicant argued that Norfleet teaches away from the Applicant's invention. The Examiner disagrees. The arrangement of the straps on the user's head is to orient the mask in the proper position. The Applicant also argues the intended use of the mask of Norfleet. In response to applicant's argument that the oxygen mask of Norfleet is for use with an infant, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 370 F.2d 576, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 312 F.2d 937, 939, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). The Examiner reminds the Applicant that both the Examiner and the Examiner's Primary did not find any allowable subject matter in the application. The Examiner will be using the newly found reference U.S. 2843121 to Hudson as provided in the supplemental 892 mailed 15 December 2004.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3731

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3 and 5-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hudson 2843121.

4. As to claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, and 10, Hudson teaches an oxygen mask 10 having a means for being secured over the nose and mouth of a patient comprising: an elastic band, points of attachment 15 on both sides of the mask, and the elastic band securable to the patient by pulling the ends anteriorally through the points of attachment (col. 2, lines 27-31). It should be noted that Hudson fails to teach a pair of bands extendible to loop over and around each ear of the patient. However, it is well known in the art of masks to secure a mask using loops around a user's ears as an alternative to having a strap/band around the user's head as evidenced in U.S. patents 2494406, 2798483, 4802473, 4941470, 5701892, 5813398, 5819731, 6079980, 6095143, and 6394090. Therefore it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use ear loops as alternative means of securing a mask. Furthermore, it is well known in the art of masks to secure a mask using loops around a user's ears to prevent entanglement of the user's hair as evidenced by 5701892 (col. 2, lines 32-33) and 5819731 (col. 1, lines 23-29).

5. As to claim 2, 6, and 9 are Hudson disclosed the claimed invention except for four separate points attachment. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made have four separate points of attachment, since it has been held that mere duplication of essential working parts of a

Art Unit: 3731

device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193

USPQ 8. Furthermore, it is well known in the art of masks to secure a mask using four points of attachment when using ear loops as evidenced by U.S. patents 2494406, 2798483, 4802473, 4941470, 5701892, 5813398, and 6394090.

6. As to claims 11-13, Hudson fails to specifically teach the use of a flap valve.

However, it is well known in the art of oxygen masks to have an exhalation port with a valve to allow exhaled air to be forced out to the atmosphere and not allow air from the atmosphere into the mask as evidenced by 4098271 and 4865027.

***Contacts***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael G. Mendoza whose telephone number is (571) 272-4698. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Dawson can be reached on (571) 272-4694. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MM

MM

  
GLENN K. DAWSON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER